



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/253,944	02/22/1999	FUMIO NARISAWA	381NP/47598	6255

7590 02/20/2003

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P O Box 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

INGBERG, TODD D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2124

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/253,944

Applicant(s)

Fumio Narisawa et al.

Examiner

INGBERG

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/30/2003
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 8, 11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 8, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2124

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 , 8, 11 and 12 have been examined.

Claims 11 and 12 have been added.

The following office action is a response to the Request for Reconsideration of December 16, 2002 and the Supplemental amendment of January 30,2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

USPN 6,230,314 **Sweeney** et al files October 2, 1997.

Rejection of claims 1 and 8 are maintained.

Claim 1

Sweeney anticipates a software generation system comprising: a specification analysis means which analyzes an object-oriented specification for deriving specification information (**Sweeney**, col 2, lines 14 -15, "This is accomplished by an analysis ..."); an optimized information input means for inputting optimized information from an external unit (Interpreted as the reading of the class structure from the file on a disk drive which is inherent), indicating a necessity or lack of necessity for use of a dynamic generation function for dynamic generation of an instance

Art Unit: 2124

representing one of a set of object oriented functions (Sweeney, col 1, lines 57 - 59, “ ...where a given member is (un) used by some, not all instances of a given class.” - the determining which are to be eliminated and which are not to eliminate dead executable code and the second step in (Sweeney, col 2, lines 15-17, “... , followed by the construction of a new, specialized class ...”); a function removing means which checks said specification information derived by said specification analysis means and the optimized information input via said optimized information inputting means by collating with a predetermined function removal rule (Sweeney, Figure 18 shows the pseudo code for the updating step and col 2, lines 15 - 19 the transformation where the dead executable code is optimized away) , which removes a function which becomes unnecessary from a set of object-oriented functions by which members are realized, for generating from the specification information and the optimized information as per the steps above, program information excluding the unnecessary function; and a code generation means for generating a code according to said program information obtained by said function removing means (Sweeney, col 2, lines 29 - 33).

Claim 8

The software generation system according to Claim 1, further comprising: an analysis result display means for displaying a status of use of an object-oriented function by which a member is realized from the specification information (Sweeney, Figure 19, shows the Specialized Class Hierarchy resulting from Step 705(b) and updated program resulting from Step 705(c) for the example program of FIG. 11.).

Art Unit: 2124

3. **Claims 11 and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a,b) as being anticipated by **Template Software's** commercial product the programming language **SNAP** as documented in the manual "Using the SNAP Development Environment".

Claim 11

Template Software anticipates a software generation system comprising (SNAP Programming language and development environment): a specification analysis means which analyzes an object-oriented specification for deriving specification information (**SNAP**, page 3-44, Figure 3-8, Function Tab part of Class Editor) ; an optimization instruction input means for a system operator inputting an optimization instruction via an external unit (**SNAP**, page 3-45, Table 3-26, mouse click on table - GetByRmt Schema example in display 3-44), indicating use or lack of use of respective object oriented functions contained within a set of object oriented functions (**SNAP**, page 3-45, click on as per above and delete, new, edit functions from table 3-26) ; a function removing means which checks said specification information derived by the specification analysis means (**SNAP**, page 3-45, delete function) and said optimization instruction input via the optimization instruction inputting means (**SNAP**, page 3-44 to 3-45 as per above), by collating with a predetermined function removal rule (**SNAP**, page 2-39, Building an Application Executable), which removes a function that becomes unnecessary from said set of object-oriented functions by which members are realized (**SNAP**, page 3-45, click on as per above and delete, new, edit functions from table 3-26 and page 3-45, delete function), for

Art Unit: 2124

generating from the specification information and the optimization instruction entered by said system operator, program information excluding the unnecessary function (SNAP, page 3-45, click on as per above and delete, new, edit functions from table 3-26 and page 3-45, delete function); and a code generation means for generating a code according to said program information obtained by said function removing means (SNAP, page 2-39 as per above dependencies in bullet item).

Claim 12

The software generation system according to Claim 11, further comprising an analysis result display means for displaying a status of use of an object-oriented function by which a member is realized from the specification information (SNAP, page 3-44, figure 3-8).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed January 30, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1 and 8 do not clearly claim the programmer's interaction with the optimization steps. In the broadest reasonable interpretation the programmer when performing the normal function of programming selects from a class browser portions of libraries that are to be included in the code is optimization. Thus programmers in an object oriented environment routinely optimize through their interaction of selecting components etc. Claim 11 does not clearly claim the optimization step as being after the program is built and reads on the normal operations of a OO programmer.

Art Unit: 2124

Allowable Subject Matter

5. It is the interpretation that figures 5 and 12 show allowable subject matter. The following is the interpretation of the Examiner from the interview as the novel aspects of the invention. The optimization step is performed after the program is written. The current claim language does not distinguish this additional step. This is critical since object oriented programmers select which classes to use or not to use as a matter of programming in the object oriented environment (OO). The current claim language in the broadest reasonable interpretation fails to distinguish over the normal actions of an OO programmer. It is possible to interpret a function removing means to be the code generation through inheritance of an object model resulting from a programmers interaction.

What the Examiner interprets as novel is the additional step after a programmer has performed the normal steps of writing an object oriented program where the analysis means is performed and the system offers use or don't use options on methods via screen such as the figures mentioned above. This added step has an element of risk because the programmer can delete a method associated with the program one or more times with the hope it does not cause an error (Figure 17 A). These distinctions are not clearly present. It is the Examiner's duty to give further search and consideration to all amendments. The Examiner encourages an after final amendment to clearly make these distinctions.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2124

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Todd Ingberg** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-9775**. The Examiner is working a Maxi-Flex schedule and can be reached Monday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the **Examiner's Supervisor, Kakali Chaki** be reached at **(703)305-9662**. Any response to this office action should be mailed to: **Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231**, or **Hand-delivered** responses should be brought to **Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia, (Receptionist located on the fourth floor)**, or **faxed**. The following **fax numbers** apply:

Art Unit: 2124

Official (703) 746 - 7239

Non Official/ Draft (703) 746 -7240

After Final (703) 746 - 7238

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Todd Ingberg', with a long diagonal line extending from the end of the signature towards the upper right.

Todd Ingberg

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2124

February 8, 2003